

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 7 being independent.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,085,591 to *Gancarcik et al.* in view of Pub. No. US 2003/0197488 A1 of *Hulvey*, and Claims 3-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gancarcik* in view of *Hulvey* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,638 to *Larsson* or U.S. Patent No. 6,795,688 to *Plasson*.

In rejecting independent Claims 1 and 7, the Examiner alleges that *Gancarcik* discloses “a controller for transmitting a wired communication request signal (request for wired communication service) which includes a user-entered phone number to a wired phone 12 via the first Bluetooth module on an established Bluetooth link”, citing, *inter alia*, Col. 2, line 12-30, line 60, to Col. 3, line 46, of *Gancarcik*. The portion of *Gancarcik* relied upon by the Examiner states that a “bi-directional serial communication link 15 ... may either be a wired connection communication protocol such as USB or RS-232 or a wireless communication protocol such as Bluetooth or IrDA.” (Col. 2, line 67, to Col. 3, line 3, of *Gancarcik*). That is, *Gancarcik* merely discloses an alternative arrangement between a PDA and a telephone via a wireless or wired connection.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the alternative arrangement of either a wired communication or a wireless communication as taught by *Gancarcik* still fails to disclose or suggest a communication link that allows the Bluetooth wireless terminal to maintain wireless communication service with the wired network via the wired phone based upon an ID key for selecting a service between a wired communication service and a wireless communication service, as

recited in independent Claims 1 and 7.

The ‘established Bluetooth link’ of *Gancarcik* that the Examiner relies upon merely allows a PDA 14 to communicate with the telephone set 12 via bi-directional serial communication link 15. (See *Gancarcik*, Col. 2, lines 66-67.) This ‘established Bluetooth link’ is used to pass a “call command...from the PDA to the telephone set and vice versa.” (Col. 2, lines 12-23, of *Gancarcik*). That is, the wirelessly enabled PDA of *Gancarcik* is used for “processing of the data (e.g., numbers to be called).” (Col. 2, line 26, of *Gancarcik*). It is respectfully submitted that neither the wirelessly enabled PDA, the ‘established Bluetooth link’, nor any other disclosure of *Gancarcik* discloses or suggests maintaining a wireless communication with the wired network via the wired phone based upon an ID key for selecting a service between a wired communication service and a wireless communication service, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 7.

Further, the Examiner admits that *Gancarcik* does not teach that the Bluetooth link has been manually established via a user interface, but asserts that it is known in the art as taught by *Hulvey*, and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Hulvey* into the method of *Gancarcik*.

It is respectfully submitted that *Hulvey* merely discloses wireless interface device communications between a wirelessly enabled host and at least one user input device. More specifically, *Hulvey* discloses an inquiry process to pair devices, e.g., mouse to host, keyboard to host. The master device finds the identity of the Bluetooth devices in its transmission/reception range by using the inquiry process. (In Fig. 11 and par [0065]-[0066]). However, the inquiry of the communication taught by *Hulvey* fails to disclose or suggest transmitting a request for a wired communication service to a wired phone network via a slave Bluetooth module of a wireless terminal based upon an ID key for selecting a service between a wired communication service and a wireless communication service, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Hulvey* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Gancarcik* described above.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, Applicant believes independent Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the combination of *Gancarcik* and *Hulvey*, and respectfully requests that the rejections thereof are withdrawn.

While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Applicant believes Claims 2-5 and 8-11 are also patentable for at least the above reasons.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5, and 7-11 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Ownes III

Reg. No. 51,314

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475